

REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for reviewing the present application.

Specification Amendments

The specification has been amended to include a reference to prior Application No. 60/427,954 in the first sentence.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended for further clarity and to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to satisfy the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 5 to 10 are new.

Novelty and Obviousness Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,842,106 to Hughes *et al.* (Hughes) and has rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes, as applied to claim 1, in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0204739 to Ng *et al.*

Despite the Examiner's objections, the Applicant asserts that claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by Hughes. Claim 1 is directed towards an antitheft device that comprises a microprocessor and a communication module. The antitheft device is part of the portable electronic equipment and travels with the equipment. Therefore, the portable equipment itself carries information indicative of its location. The Applicant appreciates that in the RFID system discussed in Hughes it is possible for the interrogator or reader (32) to track which portable RF tags have entered its signal range; however, Hughes does not teach the portable device (the RF tag) storing information indicative of its location.

Hughes instead teaches an authentication process between a portable device and an interrogator wherein the portable device (if it is the Authenticator) compares a received challenge value to one it calculates independently. The challenge value is concerned only with authentication and carries no information indicative of the location of the portable device. By successfully completing the disclosed authentication process, the interrogator only confirms that the portable RF tag that has entered its signal range is authentic.

In the Applicant's preferred embodiment, the information indicative of the location is the telephone number of that location. By using this information, the portable device can determine whether it is in the location correlating to that phone number. By contrast, Hughes has an

identification of the device, not any information of the location of the device, and it is the base station that determines whether the portable device is in its signal range.

For at least the above reasons, the Applicant asserts that claim 1 is not anticipated by Hughes. Moreover, claim 1 is not suggested by Hughes. Hughes' patent is not directed to an anti-theft device, rather to a method of authenticating and providing secure communication between the reader and the RF tags in the RFID system.

Since claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by Hughes, the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is rendered moot.

Indefiniteness Rejections

Claims 1 to 3 have been amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Notably, "said information" has been changed to "said data" in claim 1, and the preamble of claims 2 and 3 have been amended to "An antitheft device according to...."


Priority Objection

The specification has been amended to include a reference to prior Application No. 60/427,954 in the first sentence.

Summary

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes claims 1 to 10 are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests early reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



John R.S. Orange
Agent for Applicant
Registration No. 29,725

Date: December 7, 2007

BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP
Suite 2800, P.O. Box 25
199 Bay Street, Commerce Court West
Toronto, Ontario M5L 1A9
CANADA

Tel: 416-863-3164
JO/JEFL